

Remarks

Submitted concurrently with the filing of a RCE is the response to the final rejection office action dated August 16, 2004.

The feature of the inventions of amended claims 11, 14, 21, and 25 is that an encryption-resultant contents information provider side generates previously-fed issue ID information as a result of Exclusive-OR operation between the decryption-side ID information and a preset fixed authentication value.

The feature of the inventions is supported in the specification, page 15, lines 3-11. According to this portion of the specification, the result of Exclusive-OR operation between the secondary-section ID information and the issue ID information is equal to the specified authentication value. It is understood from the general characteristic of Exclusive-OR operation that the result of Exclusive-OR operation between the secondary-section ID information and the specified authentication value is equal to the issue ID information. Therefore, it is reasonable that the contents-information provider side generates the issue ID information by implementing Exclusive-OR operation between the secondary-section ID information and the specified authentication value.

The pending claims were rejected under Pinder et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,134).

In Pinder et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,105,134), the combination of a block 203 and a block 204 in Fig. 2A relates to authentication in the information provider side (the information encryption side). Pinder et al, column 6, lines 30-34, disclose that the block 203 can be either a physically random number generator or can use a sequential counter with a suitable randomization algorithm to produce a stream of random control words (CWs). Pinder et al, column 6, lines 36-45, disclose that the block 204 encrypts each new control word (CW) by using a key and then the CW is combined into entitlement control messages (ECM) with other service-related information, and that the block 204 authenticates the ECM

while producing a message authentication code using a keyed-hash value derived from the message content combined with a secret.

Therefore, Pinder et al do not teach the feature of the inventions of amended claims 11, 14, 21, and 25 that an encryption-resultant contents information provider side generates previously-fed issue ID information as a result of Exclusive-OR operation between the decryption-side ID information and a preset fixed authentication value. Thus, Pinder et al do not teach using Exclusive-OR operation to generate previously-fed issue ID information.

In the inventions of amended claims 11, 14, 21, and 25, since the authentication value is fixed, the related structure can be simple. In this regard, the inventions of amended claims 11, 14, 21, and 25 are advantageous over the system of Pinder et al.

In view of the foregoing, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application and pass the same to issue at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Louis Woo, Reg. No. 31,730
Law Offices of Louis Woo
717 North Fayette Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 299-4090

Date: Oct 12, 2004